

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application, with Claim 1 being independent.

Claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 have been amended. Claims 8, 18 and 20 have been cancelled. Thus, Claims 1-7, 9-17 and 19 remain in prosecution.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and Claims 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that Claim 1 would be allowable and that Claims 2-7, 9-17 and 19 would be allowable as well if they are rewritten to overcome the Section 112 rejections. Applicant expressly reserves the right to do so. In the meantime, however, Applicant responds to the Action as follows:

Response to Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicant's cancellation of Claims 8, 18 and 20 renders the Section 112 rejections advanced against those claims moot.

As regards the remaining claims, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to overcome Section 112 rejections. Applicant intends to embrace by the photointiator radical generating component materials as are embodied in the structure shown. For instance, pyrylium-based materials are exemplified in the Specification, at page 8, lines 20-27.

As far as the symbol "X", "X" is representative of anions, non-limiting examples of which being set forth in the Specification at page 8, lines 6-19.

As regards the Section 112 rejection of Claim 11, Applicant has set forth in the Markush group styrenes, (meth)acrylates and combinations thereof. The Examiner has questioned whether (meth)acrylates are monomers, oligomers, or polymers having (meth)acrylate functional groups. Applicant makes brief reference to styrenes and (meth)acrylates in the Specification at page 8. However, provided the compound included in the non-cyanoacrylate based radical curable component has a styrene or (meth)acrylate functional group, that compound should be acceptable for use in connection with the present invention.

Having addressed the Section 112 rejections, Applicant respectfully requests resindication and withdrawal thereof.

Response to Section 102 Rejections

Claims 18 and 20 stand rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by European Patent No. 769721 or U.S. Patent No 5,922,783.

While Applicant does not agree with or concede the propriety of the Section 102 rejections, for the sake of expediency, Claims 18 and 20 have been cancelled.

Accordingly, Applicants submit the Section 102 rejections of these claims has been mooted.

Application No. 10/088,064
Response to Office Action dated October 3, 2003
Amendment of November 24, 2003

Miscellaneous

Applicant notes that the Examiner has indicated that she did not receive a PTO-Form 1449, together with the Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant provides another copy of that PTO-Form 1449 together herewith, and respectfully requests that the Examiner initial each of the entries indicating that she has considered the information listed therein.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at (860) 571-5001, by facsimile at (860) 571-5028 or by e-mail at steve.bauman@loctite.com. All correspondence should be directed to the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven C. Bauman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,832

HENKEL LOCTITE CORPORATION
Legal Department
1001 Trout Brook Crossing
Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067

F:\User\BaumanSt\WORD\PATENTS\Amendments&Responses\ICC-211-pct us.doc